

REMARKS

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5/2, 6, 7/5/2, 8-11, 18 and 28 have been rejected as anticipated by Petrillo (U.S. 3,797,657). Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 21, 28, 31-35, 38-48, 51 and 52 have been rejected as anticipated by Kohring (U.S. 5,518,114). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is axiomatic that in order to anticipate a claim, a reference must disclose each and every feature in the claim. That is not the case here. The Examiner asserts that both references disclose a latch that is sufficiently rigid to resist movement during removal of a cartridge from the dispenser. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In both references, movement of the latch is essential to the proper functioning of the dispenser.

Petrillo explicitly states that the latches move during cartridge removal. The latch posts or lugs 24, 26 are resilient (col. 3, line 41), allowing them to flex apart when the cartridge is removed (col. 3, lines 28-31). Thus, the latches do not resist movement but instead are designed to move during removal of a cartridge from the dispenser.

In Kohring, the latches (flanges 32, 33 with detents 35, 36) must deflect in order to allow the cartridge to be removed from the cartridge retaining means. This is clear from Fig. 11 of Kohring. Kohring is silent regarding the construction of cartridge C, and thus there is no basis whatsoever for the Examiner's assertion that "the entire housing [of the blade unit] is a resilient latching portion" (Office action, page 6, lines 17-18). Instead, the artisan would have understood that the very thin walls of flanges 32, 33 would allow the flanges to deflect in response to a force applied by the cartridge during removal. Moreover, Kohring himself states that the receptacle (dispenser) is manufactured of a material "providing a rigidity suitable for mounting into a razor handle support...while maintaining the flexibility necessary to retain and dispense a razor blade cartridge C." (Kohring, col. 6, lines 61-65, emphasis ours.) The artisan would have understood this statement to mean that the material was relatively rigid in thick section (e.g., the outer walls of the dispenser) but flexible in thin section (i.e., the flanges and detents) to allow deflection of the latches during dispensing of cartridge C.

Thus, neither reference discloses Applicant's claimed "latch that is sufficiently rigid to resist movement during removal of a cartridge from the dispenser," and in fact both references teach away from such a feature.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 6, 7/5/3, 29, 30, 36, 37, 59, and 60 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Kohring.

These claims are patentable for at least the reason that they depend from a patentable base claim, for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 1, 18, 19, 20, 23-28, 48-50, 54 and 56-58 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Kohring in view of Petricca, and claim 55 has been rejected as being unpatentable over these references further combined with Rozenkranc.

Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the reasons discussed above. Neither Petricca nor Rozenkranc supply that which is lacking in the primary references. Petricca discloses a latch 22 that clearly must deflect when the cartridge is removed from the dispenser. Rozenkranc, cited for a teaching of a trimming blade, adds nothing of relevance.

New Claims

Applicant submits that claim 66 is patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 67 has a scope similar to that of original claim 55, with additional language clarifying that the protective feature is configured so as to protect the trimming blade. This feature is discussed in detail at page 12, lines 6-10 of Applicant's disclosure. Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is patentable over the art of record, as neither a protective feature on the upper divider edge, nor its interaction with a trimming blade is disclosed in the cited references.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

If Applicant has not addressed each and every point made by the Examiner, it does not mean that Applicant concedes such points. Applicants reserve the right to address any such issues in further prosecution.

Please apply any charges or credits, including the fee for Extension of Time, to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 00216-657001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2006

/Celia H. Leber/
Celia H. Leber
Reg. No. 33,524

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906